



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/657,492

09/08/2003

Bradley Richard Ree

03002.1000

2673

35856

7590

01/22/2008

SMITH FROHWEIN TEMPEL GREENLEE BLAHA, LLC

Two Ravinia Drive

Suite 700

ATLANTA, GA 30346

EXAMINER

PHAN, MAN U

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2619

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

01/22/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/657,492	Applicant(s) REE ET AL.	
	Examiner Man Phan	Art Unit 2619	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,5-13,18-20,22 and 23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2-4, 14-17, 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Amendment and Argument

1. This communication is in response to applicant's 11/07/2007 Amendment in the application of Ree et al. for a "Client-server architecture for the delivery of broadband services" filed 09/08/2003. Claims 1-2, 19, 23 have been amended. Claims 1-23 are pending in the present application.
2. Applicant's remarks and argument to the rejected claims are insufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior arts or overcome the rejection of said claims under 35 U.S.C. 103 as discussed below. Applicant's argument with respect to the pending claims have been fully considered, but they are not persuasive for at least the following reasons.
3. In response to applicant's argument that the combination of cited references fails to present a prima facie case of obviousness. In response, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). It is not necessary that a "prima facie" case of unpatentability exist as to the claim in order for "a substantial new question of patentability" to be present as to the claim. Thus, "a substantial new question of patentability" as to a patent claim could be present even if the examiner would not necessarily reject the claim as either fully anticipated by, or obvious in view of, the prior art patents or printed publications. As to the importance of the difference between "a substantial new question of patentability" and a "prima facie" case of unpatentability see

generally *In re Etter*, 756 F.2d 852, 857 n.5, 225 USPQ 1, 4 n.5 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Also, See MPEP § 2141.01(a) for a discussion of analogous and nonanalogous art in the context of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103. See MPEP § 2131.05 for a discussion of analogous and nonanalogous art in the context of 35 U.S.C. 102. 904.02. The Examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed combination of primary and secondary references. *In re Nomiya*, 184 USPQ 607 (CCPA 1975). However, there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly articulated. The test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re McLaughlin*, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). It must be recognized that any judgement on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. *In re McLaughlin*, 443, F.2d 1392; 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

4. In response to Applicant's argument that the reference does not teach or reasonably suggest the functionality upon which the Examiner relies for the rejection. The Examiner first emphasizes for the record that the claims employ a broader in scope than the Applicant's disclosure in all aspects. In addition, the Applicant has not argued any narrower interpretation of the claim limitations, nor amended the claims significantly enough to construe a narrower meaning to the limitations. Since the claims breadth allows multiple interpretations and

meanings, which are broader than Applicant's disclosure, the Examiner is required to interpret the claim limitations in terms of their broadest reasonable interpretations while determining patentability of the disclosed invention. See MPEP 2111. In other words, the claims must be given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification and the interpretation that those skilled in the art would reach. See *In re Hyatt*, 211 F.3d 1367, 1372, 54 USPQ2d 1664, 1667 (Fed. Cir. 2000), *In re Cortright*, 165 F.3d 1353, 1359, 49 USPQ2d 1464, 1468 (Fed. Cir. 1999), and *In re American Academy of Science Tech Center*, 2004 WL 1067528 (Fed. Cir. May 13, 2004). Any term that is not clearly defined in the specification must be given its plain meaning as understood by one of ordinary skill in the art. See MPEP 2111.01. See also *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989), *Sunrace Roots Enter. Co. v. SRAM Corp.*, 336 F.3d 1298, 1302, 67 USPQ2d 1438, 1441 (Fed. Cir. 2003), *Brookhill-Wilk 1, LLC v. Intuitive Surgical, Inc.*, 334 F.3d 1294, 1298 67 USPQ2d 1132, 1136 (Fed. Cir. 2003). The interpretation of the claims by their broadest reasonable interpretation reduces the possibility that, once the claims are issued, the claims are interpreted more broadly than justified. See *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969). Also, limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Therefore, the failure to significantly narrow definition or scope of the claims and supply arguments commensurate in scope with the claims implies the Applicant intends broad interpretation be given to the claims. The Examiner has interpreted the claims in parallel to the Applicant in the response and reiterates the need for the Applicant to distinctly define the claimed invention.

In response to Applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references as proposed in the office action. The Examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that there must be some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed combination of primary and secondary references. *In re Nomiya*, 184 USPQ 607 (CCPA 1975). However, there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly articulated. The test for combining references is what the combination of disclosures taken as a whole would suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art. *In re McLaughlin*, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971). It must be recognized that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

5. Applicant's argument with respect to the rejected claims that the cited references fail to teach or suggest the novel concept of the "modem does not require a network stack formatting". However, in the broadband services, the application of a network stack to the voice packets is performed by the server prior to sending the packets over the public network, and not in modem.

Since no substantial amendments have been made and the Applicant's arguments are not persuasive, the claims are drawn to the same invention and the text of the prior art rejection can be found in the previous Office Action. Therefore, the Examiner maintains that the references cited and applied in the last office actions for the rejection of the claims are maintained in this office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC ' 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. Claims 1, 5-13, 18-20, 22, 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Edmon et al. (US#2004/0042444).

With respect to claims 1 and 12, the Applicant's admitted prior art shown in Figs. 1 and 2 illustrated the modem and server for providing voice functionality over a packet network, according to the essential features of the claims. Fig. 1 of the Applicant's admitted prior art discloses a cable modem 200 for providing connection between a telephone unit 180 and a cable

network 170. The telephone unit 180 interfaces to the modem 200 through a subscriber line interface (SLIC) 105, supplies the high voltage interface to an analog telephone 180 (the VoIP client) and provides a bi-directional analog voice stream to a codec (encoder/decoder) 110. Of course, the VoIP service could also be provided for digital type telephones by modifying the interface to the SLIC 105. The codec 110 contains an analog to digital (AD) and digital to analog (DA) converter that is used to provide a bi-directional digital data stream to a processor 130 (specification, page 3, lines 8 plus).

However, Applicant's admitted prior art does not disclose expressly the voice interface circuit for processing voice data packets without applying a network stack to the voice packets. In the same field of endeavor, Edmon et al. (US#2004/0042444) teaches in Fig. 4 a flow diagram illustrated an exemplary application logic for routing incoming VoIP communications through a media gateway (*of a voice signal initiated at the VoIP called party end-system 42*). Each voice packet routed through the IP network 40 is received by the media gateway 24 at step s410. The media gateway 24 reads the IP/UDP/RTP header at step s412 and maps the IP/UDP/RTP header to the BLES CID, using the CID assignment table, at step s414. Upon identifying the BLES CID, the media gateway 24 determines that the communication proceeds without a header. Therefore, at step s416, the media gateway 24 removes the IP/UDP/RTP header from the voice packet. The voice packet, without the header, is encapsulated in an AAL2 cell at step s418. At step s420, the AAL2 cell is routed through the ATM network 20 to the subscriber end-system 10 to complete the transmission. Like the VoIP called party end-system 42, the subscriber end-system 10 processes the voice packet to enhance the clarity and reliability of the communication (*without stack formatting process*). When the media gateway

24 determines that the BLES CID of the voice packet is not included in its CID assignment table as a VoIP application, the media gateway 24 does not assign an IP/UDP/RTP header. With no IP/UDP/RTP header, the voice packet can not be properly routed through the IP network 40. Therefore, the media gateway 24 converts the voice packet to TDM signaling and passes the TDM signaling through the IMT 32 to the switch 34 of the PSTN 30, as discussed above with respect to steps s216-s220 of Fig. 2, regardless of whether the called number has an associated IP address. The subscriber end-system 10 is then able to communicate with the PSTN called party terminal 36 ([0084]-[0088]).

Regarding claim 18, generally in a priority case, if a voice packet and a data packet are both received by the same router, the voice packet is given priority in order to avoid introducing latency to the voice packet delivery and reassembly, which means the voice packets will generally be given higher scheduling priority than the data packets.

Regarding claims 5-7, 13, the Applicant's admitted prior art shown in Figs. 1-2 including the SLIC and the CODEC are operable to interface to an analog, digital or wireless telephone.

Regarding claims 8-11, the Applicant's admitted prior art shown in Figs. 1-2 wherein the communication network including coaxial, twisted pair, fiber and wireless technology.

With respect to claims 19, 20, 22, they are method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims as discussed in paragraph above. Therefore, claims 19, 20, 22 are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims above.

With respect to claim 23, it's a system claim corresponding to the apparatus and method claims as discussed in paragraph above. Therefore, claim 23 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims above.

One skilled in the art would have recognized the need for effectively and efficiently process voice data packets in cable network, and would have applied Edmon's logic for routing incoming VoIP communications through a media gateway, and efficiently establishing voice over Internet protocol (IP) connections over a broadband network into the novel use of the cable modem in Applicant's admitted prior art. Therefore, It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to apply Edmon's VoIP service through broadband network into Applicant's admitted prior art with the motivation being to provide a method and system for the delivery of broadband services.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 2-4, 14-17, 21 are objected to as being dependent upon the rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims.

10. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The closest prior art of record fails to disclose or suggest wherein the communication network interface is operable to: transmit and receive data packets over the communication network without the application and removal of network stack formatting; provide data packets received from the communication network to the local network interface; and provide data packets received from the local network interface to the communication network, as specifically recited in the claims.

11. Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP ' 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to M. Phan whose telephone number is (571) 272-3149. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri from 6:00 to 3:00.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jay Patel, can be reached on (571) 272-2988. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (571) 272-2600.

14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have any questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at toll free 1-866-217-9197.

Mphan

Jan. 18, 20078

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Mphan', is written over the typed name and date.